

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00553 01 OF 02 211122Z

12

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /089 W

----- 107548

P R 211025Z NOV 75

FM US DEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1295

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0553

NOFORN

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REPRESENTATIVES OF NOVEMBER  
17, 1975

REF: MBFR VIENNA 0524

1. ON NOVEMBER 17 US REP, US DEPREP AND JCS REP HAD A  
BILATERAL MEETING ON FORCE DEFINITIONS WITH SOVIET  
REPS KHLESTOV AND SMIRNOVSKY AND SOVIET MILREP KAPITONOV.  
SISSION HAD BEEN ARRANGED IN PREVIOUS MEETING ON NOVEMBER 6.  
US REP REVEIWED THE PROPOSED WESTERN FORCE DEFINITION  
FORMULATION, POINTING OUT HOW IT MET EASTERN INTERESTS  
AS WELL AS THOSE OF THE WEST. KHLESTOV SAID HE COULD NOT  
AGREE WITH THIS POSITIVE ESTIMATE. THE WESTERN  
UNIFORM DEFINITION WAS FALLACIOUS IN METHOD AND

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00553 01 OF 02 211122Z

RESULTED IN DIFFICULTIES. KHLESTOV PRESSED HARD FOR AC-

CEPTANCE OF EASTERN SOLUTION OF THE THREE DISPUTED CASES: SSM AND HELICOPTER FORCES TO GROUND, GROUND-BASED TERRITORIAL AIR DEFENSE TO AIR. US REP SAID FINAL ALLOCATION OF THESE CASES WAS NOT POSSIBLE WITHOUT DATA.

2. KHLESTOV SAID THAT, IN ADDITION TO GENERAL WEAKNESS OF WESTERN DEFINITION, IT CONTAINED FOLLOWING SPECIFIC DEFECTS:

A. IT WAS NOT CLEAR THAT FRENCH FORCES ARE INCLUDED.

B. IT DID NOT EXPLICITLY INDICATE THAT ALLIED FORCES IN THE WESTERN SECTOR OF BERLIN WERE INCLUDED. THIS SHOULD BE DONE.

C. IT DID NOT APPEAR TO COVER FRG TERRITORIAL FORCES.

D. IT FOCUSED ON MANPOWER AND DID NOT PERMIT AN INTERPRETATION THAT ARMAMENTS WERE ALSO COVERED.

E. IT REFERRED TO NATO AND THE WARSAW PACT. THE TWO ALLIANCES SHOULD NOT BE SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED IN A NEUTRALLY WORDED DOCUMENT.

F. IT DID NOT PROVIDE A WAY OF DEALING WITH CANADIAN FORCES, ALTHOUGH HE RECOGNIZED THAT THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS HAD INDICATED THEY WOULD DEAL WITH THIS PROBLEM.

3. US REP SAID THAT THE DEFINITION DID COVER FRENCH FORCES. HE SAID THAT IT WAS NOT WISE TO RAISE THE BERLIN ISSUE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PRESENT NEGOTIATIONS. IT SHOULD BE KEPT OUT COMPLETELY. US REP REPEATEDLY ASKED KHLESTOV WHETHER, IN ADDITION TO THESE POINTS AND THE THREE DISPUTED CASES, SOVIETS HAD OTHER DIFFICULTIES WITH WESTERN DEFINITION. SOVIETS REPLIED THAT, AS FAR AS THEY COULD SEE, THERE WERE NO OTHER DIFFICULTIES. THUS, DESPITE OPPORTUNITY TO DO SO, SOVIETS DID NOT INDICATE RELUCTANCE TO EXCLUDE RESERVES FROM SCOPE OF A DEFINITION, A PROBLEM WE HAD ANTICIPATED IN VIEW OF THEIR EARLIER REFERENCE TO FRG STANDBY RESERVES. HOWEVER,

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00553 01 OF 02 211122Z

KHLESTOV CONTINUED TO REJECT USING CONCEPT OF "ACTIVE DUTY" TO LIMIT THE FORCES TO BE COVERED BY A DEFINITION OF FORCES, AND IN A BILATERAL TALK WITH THE FRG DELEGATION THE NEXT DAY, NOVEMBER 18, COLONEL KAPETONOV ONCE AGAIN CONTESTED WHETHER THE FRG STANDBY READINESS FORCE SHOULD BE EXCLUDED AND TREATED AS A ORDINARY RESERVE.

4. KHLESTOV AGAIN MADE EASTERN AGREEMENT TO SPECIFICATION

OF EXCLUSIONS FROM A DEFINITION CONDITIONAL ON  
WESTERN AGREEMENT TO SPECIFIC ALLOCATION OF THE THREE  
DISPUTED CASES ALONG SOVIET LINES. US REP SAID PROGRESS  
IN THIS WAY WOULD NOT BE POSSIBLE. HE SAID THAT IF THE  
SOVIETS THEMSELVES WANTED TO TAKE THE INITIATIVE TO  
PROPOSE A COMPROMISE DEFINITIONS, US REP WOULD BE WILLING  
TO RECOMMEND IT TO HIS AUTHORITIES IF IT WAS GENERALLY  
SATISFACTORY. SUCH A COMPROMISE MUST PROVIDE FOR THE  
INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS SPECIFIED BY THE WEST,  
AND CONTAIN A FORMULA FOR ALLOCATING FORCES BETWEEN  
GROUND AND AIR WHICH WOULD MAKE USE OF THE UNIFORM PRINCIPLE.  
IT MIGHT ALSO CONTAIN REFERENCE TO THE PRINCIPLE OF ALLO-  
CATING SIMILAR FORCES TO THE SAME CATEGORY IN CONNECTION  
WITH THE THREE DISPUTED CASES, PROVIDED ACTUAL ALLOCATION  
WAS LEFT TO A LATER DATE. KHLESTOV SHOULD ALSO UNDERSTAND  
THAT ANY FINAL ALLOCATION OF THE FORCES INVOLVED  
WOULD STILL HAVE TO DEPEND ON DATA EXCHANGE.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00553 02 OF 02 211105Z

12

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /089 W

----- 107376

P R 211025Z NOV 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1296

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0553

NOFORN

FROM US REP MBFR

5. KHLESTOV SAID HE SAW NO ADVANTAGE IN THIS IDEA AND CONTINUED TO INSIST ON SPECIFIC RESOLUTION OF THE THREE DISPUTED CASES AS A PRECONDITION FOR SOVIET AGREEMENT TO THE TEXT OF A DEFINITION. US REP SUGGESTED THAT, SINCE KHLESTOV WAS SO INSISTENT ON LINKING SOLUTION OF THE THREE DISPUTED CASES WITH PROVISIONS OF A DEFINITION COVERING INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS AND SINCE SPECIFIC ALLOCATION WAS NOT POSSIBLE WITHOUT DATA, PERHAPS PARTICIPANTS SHOULD FOCUS ON THE MIDDLE SECTION OF A DEFINITION, THE FORMULATION WHICH SPECIFICALLY ALLOCATED THE FORCES IN THE AREA TO GROUND OR AIR AND SEE WHETHER IT MIGHT NOT BE POSSIBLE TO BRING THE FORMULATION OF BOTH SIDES TOGETHER WHILE BRACKETING OR OTHERWISE EXCLUDING PLACEMENT OF THE THREE DISPUTED TYPES OF FORCES. US REP SAID DISCUSSION OF THIS POINT WOULD AT LEAST BE FACTUAL AND PERHAPS RESULT

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00553 02 OF 02 211105Z

IN SOME CLARITY AS REGARDS FORMULATIONS AND CONCEPTS WHICH MIGHT HAVE SOME USE IN THE FUTURE, IN DISTINCTION TO STERILE DISCUSSION OF OVERALL REDUCTION APPROACHES IN THE INFORMAL SESSION. KHLESTOV SAID HE WAS NOT SURE THAT THERE WAS MUCH POINT IN CONTINUING THE DEFINITIONS EXERCISE ANY FURTHER BUT HE WOULD CONSIDER THIS IDEA AND INFORM US REP LATER OF HIS REACTION TO IT.

6. IN SUBSEQUENT BRIEF DISCUSSION NOVEMBER 20, KHLESTOV SAID HE THOUGHT IT BETTER TO CONTINUE DISCUSSION OF THE WHOLE RANGE OF A POSSIBLE DEFINITION RATHER THAN ONLY A PART OF IT. KHLESTOV IMPLIED HE DID NOT WISH TO BE HAMPERED IN PUSHING FOR WESTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THE EASTERN PROPOSAL FOR ALLOCATION OF THE THREE DISPUTED CASES. US REP SAID KHLESTOV SHOULD BE AWARE THERE WAS NO REPEAT NO POSSIBILITY THAT THE WEST WOULD DROP ITS REQUIREMENT FOR DATA, BUT IF KHLESTOV WANTED ACROSS-THE-BOARD DISCUSSION OF A DEFINITION, THIS WAS OF COURSE ACCEPTABLE. RESOR

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** POLICIES, DIPLOMATIC DISCUSSIONS, BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS, NEGOTIATIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 21 NOV 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** greeneet  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975MBFRV00553  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750406-0083  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19751121/aaaaasah.tel  
**Line Count:** 211  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** 75 MBFR VIENNA 524  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** greeneet  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <17 SEP 2003 by greeneet>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REPRESENTATIVES OF NOVEMBER 17, 1975  
**TAGS:** PARM, UR, US, NATO, MBFR  
**To:** STATE DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006